

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/634,701	WOOD, DOUGLAS A.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	MARK A. X RADTKE	2165	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) MARK A. X RADTKE (3) _____

(2) Marcia Doubet (Applicant's Representative) (4) _____

Date of Interview: 24 August 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: n/a.

Identification of prior art discussed: Vaschillo.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's Representative called and informed Examiner that the Vaschillo reference was not available as a prior art reference due to its filing date. The Examiner agreed that an error had been made and withdrew the rejection of 25 June 2009.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.